# ABSTRACT/PAPER REVIEW FORM
# 2018 DCA CONFERENCE

**Abstract Number: 011**

**Abstract/Paper Title: Need not Nostalgia: on the efficiencies of analog drawing for beginning design students**

Please mark the appropriate column and add mandatory written feedback below. The right hand column is for ranking by numeric number (1 being lowest and 10 being highest) for each row. Please add total.

| | YES | Needs Work | NO | Please rank by a numeric number below for each row, 10 being highest 1 being lowest |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Proposed abstract/paper addresses the conference theme or sub-themes | v | | | 10 |
| 2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice. | v | | | 7 |
| 3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly. | v | | | 9 |
| 4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections. | | v | | 7 |
| 5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic. | v | | | 8 |
| 6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate. | | v | | 6 |
| 7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting. | v | | | 8 |
| 8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant. | | | v | 0 |
| 9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | | v | | 7 |
| 10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees | v | | | 8 |
| **Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 70** | | | | |

**Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):**
- Missing references that can support the topic
- Double-check the second image label – spring 2017?
- A lack of the originality
- What is the research method(s) that helped the researcher to reveal those results? Be more specific about findings/results regarding analog drawings.
- How can the abstract title be connected to two different architecture design studios' work examples/projects? What did the author emphasize the analog drawings' efficiencies through these examples?
- What is the conclusion? → need to be a little bit more specific

**Reviewer Recommendation:**
Please indicate which of the following actions you recommend.

**( )** 1. **Recommended** (no significant changes suggested)

**(v )** 2. **Recommended with Reservation** (suggest changes to the manuscript as specified in this review)

**( )** 3. **Not Recommended**

# ABSTRACT/PAPER REVIEW FORM
# 2018 DCA CONFERENCE

**Abstract Number: 011**

**Abstract/Paper Title: Need Not Nostalgia:  Analog Drawing**

Please mark the appropriate column and add mandatory written feedback below. The right hand column is for ranking by numeric number (1 being lowest and 10 being highest) for each row. Please add total.

| | YES | Needs Work | NO | Please rank by a numeric number below for each row, 10 being highest 1 being lowest |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Proposed abstract/paper addresses the conference theme or sub-themes | x | | | 7 |
| 2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice. | x | | | 7 |
| 3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly. | x | | | 7 |
| 4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections. | | x | | 6 |
| 5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic. | | x | | 6 |
| 6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate. | | x | | 6 |
| 7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting. | x | | | 7 |
| 8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant. | | x | | 6 |
| 9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | | x | | 6 |
| 10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees | x | | | 7 |
| **Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 7-** | | | | |

**Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):**

The abstract is brief, but promising.

It is interesting to consider to what extent 'tangible' techniques of drawing and modelling have 'survived' in practice, particularly in creative design, and to address the issue of to what extent – an d how – students should be educated and stimulated in developing and applying these skills.

Promising, needs work…

**Reviewer Recommendation:**
Please indicate which of the following actions you recommend.
**( )** 1. **Recommended** (no significant changes suggested)

**(X)** 2. **Recommended with Reservation** (suggest changes to the manuscript as specified in this review)

**( )** 3. **Not Recommended**

**Abstract Number: 011**

**Abstract/Paper Title: Need not nostalgia…**

Please mark the appropriate column and add mandatory written feedback below. The right hand column is for ranking by numeric number (1 being lowest and 10 being highest) for each row. Please add total.

|  | YES | Needs Work | NO | Please rank by a numeric number below for each row, 10 being highest 1 being lowest |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Proposed abstract/paper addresses the conference theme or sub-themes |  | X |  | 5 |
| 2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice. |  | X |  | 5 |
| 3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly. |  | X |  | 5 |
| 4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections. |  | X |  | 5 |
| 5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic. |  | X |  | 5 |
| 6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate. |  | X |  | 5 |
| 7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting. |  | X |  | 5 |
| 8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant. |  |  | X | 2 |
| 9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. |  |  | X | 2 |
| 10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees |  |  | X | 2 |
| **Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 41** | | | | |

**Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):**

The argument is based on a historically false binary, of digital v analog, and bases everything on a 'straw-man' tactic, not a reassuring argument based on zero concrete evidence. No citations and no representative innovation on this narrative are present. Without these revisions I would recommend we reject the abstract. The project work shown doesn't seem to connect to the argument with any degree of specificity. Link these examples and provide some description of innovative methods. This tired discussion has been had, what does this paper add to the discourse??

**Reviewer Recommendation:**
Please indicate which of the following actions you recommend.
**( )** 1. **Recommended** (no significant changes suggested)

**( X )** 2. **Recommended with Reservation** (suggest changes to the manuscript as specified in this review)

**( )** 3. **Not Recommended**